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Art and Icons Lost in East Prussia: The Fate of German Seizures from Kyiv Museums

Cultural plunder and wartime losses on the Eastern Front during the Second World War have been inadequately studied at home and abroad. Many have never realized that “Two-thirds of all cultural losses suffered by the former Soviet Union were losses of Ukraine.”¹

The controversies and misconceptions surrounding cultural losses have deeply affected the historical memory of that most horrendous twentieth-century war, yet the long suppression of sources has complicated and often made it impossible to establish the truth. With the symbolic focus on the Amber Chamber and other treasures from the Russian imperial palaces, Ukraine has often been forgotten. This article presents a case study of the fate of collections from two Kyiv museums – and icons from a third – most of which were deliberately destroyed by the Germans when the Red Army arrived in their East Prussian sanctuary in February 1945, a story never adequately told in the Soviet period, and only partially since.

The Kyiv Museum of Russian Art (today the Kyiv National Museum of Russian Art) celebrated its ninetieth anniversary in November 2012, having first opened as the Kyiv Picture Gallery in 1922 (Fig. 1) based on the collections of the Tereshchenko family in the home of its founders.² What had earlier been the Kyiv State Museum of Western and Oriental Art, and in the 1920s the Art Museum of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, is today the Bohdan and Varvara Khanenko National Museum of Art.

* Last updated: 19 Jan. 2013. – This article supplements my monograph: GRIMSTED Trophies of War and Empire, and my initial account GRIMSTED The Fate of Ukrainian Cultural Treasures, and GRIMSTED Dolisinnosti. – Throughout this article in citations to fonds in Russian and Ukrainian archives, the first number cited represents the fond, the second the opis’ (Ukrainian opys) and the third the file (ed. kh., delo, or sprava). The same usage is followed for the equivalent record groups in US Archives or Beständen in German archives; although in the US and German cases, series (opis’) numbers do not apply in archival citations.

¹ EICHWEIDE Models of Restitution, p. 219.
² The latest (2006) guide, Kievskii muzei russkogo iskusstva, issued before the “National” designation was added to the official name, includes an introductory history about the museum and its collections. The museum website has Ukrainian, Russian, and English variants: http://www.knrm.com.ua (15 Jan. 2013).
Since Ukrainian independence, its name honors the Khanenko family who brought together the most impressive and valuable collection of art in Ukrainian lands before 1917. One former curator has called it “the most complete universal collection in Russia,” with important examples from around the world.³ A large part was dispersed, particularly parts of the collection that Khanenko had sent to Moscow for safekeeping during the First World War.⁴ Like the Tereshchenko Collection a few doors away, the Khanenko Collection (Fig. 2) was nationalized following revolution and civil war. In the 1920s and 1930s, some prime art objects were seized by Soviet authorities for the ‘treasures into tractors’ sales.⁵ Most significant were the famous paintings of “Adam” and “Eve” by Lucas Cranach the Elder, first identified in Kyiv by museum deputy director Serhii Hiliarov, now hanging in the Norton Simon Gallery in Pasadena, California.⁶ Nonetheless, even after the substantial losses as a result of the Second World War, the 1957 guide could claim that the Kyiv State Museum of Western and Oriental Art ranks as “the most valuable collection of foreign art in Ukraine.”⁷ But that guide to be sure failed to mention details of the wartime losses or any of the interwar sales.

The lavish 2010 catalogue of the Khanenko Museum presents highlights of the current holdings.⁸ Those two museums, based on the two most important prerevolutionary art col-

³ Akinsha Vremia kollektsii, p. 59. KHANENKO Spohady kolektsionera, the recently published journal of the founder, provides rich details about his acquisitions. The founding curator Georgii KRESKENT’EVICH UKOMSKII describes the original museum in his Istoricheskii ocherk.

⁴ See, for example, Akinsha Ślady kolekcji Hanenko / Traces of the Khanenko Collection. Akinsha presented a seminar at the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute in 2009 with his as yet unpublished updated account of the dispersal of the Khanenko Collection with reference to examples of current locations.

⁵ The article by Bilenko Gostorg i Muzei Khanenkov, references a number of museum losses through Soviet seizures for sales abroad, and cites additional sources.

⁶ Hilarov Novoznайдені твір Кранаха; Akinsha Bo’ otechestva. See also the case study on the Cranach paintings in the AAM Guide to Provenance Research, pp. 135–137. Both Hiliarov and Kul’zenko published about the losses during German occupation, including “Adam” and “Eve,” as noted in their KGB files mentioned below.

⁷ Ovchinnikov Kievskii gosudarstvennyi muzei zapadnogo i vostochnogo iskusstva, p. 3.

⁸ The 2010 catalogue with quality colored illustrations also provides an historical introduction about the museum and the Khanenko family in English and Ukrainian: Bilenko [et al.] Muzei mystetstv. The museum website is only in Ukrainian: http://www.khanenkomuseum.kiev.ua/ (15 Jan. 2013).
lections in Ukrainian lands, remain neighbors on what is now Tereshchenko Street. Both are still housed in the buildings that were lucky enough to survive the war – the impressive homes of their prerevolutionary owners. Today, however, their current publications and websites say nothing about the many gaps in the original world-famous private and religious collections destroyed in East Prussia in 1945 and the recently revived hope of retrieving possible survivors.

On the eve of the German invasion in 1941 Soviet authorities managed to evacuate a reported 600 pieces of art from the Kyiv Museum of Russian Art, including approximately 60 icons from the two museums. The Soviets had also evacuated about 200 paintings and other works of art from the Museum of Western and Oriental Art next door, including much of what was left of the original Khanenko Collection. The evacuated art spent the war safely in Ufa and was returned to Kyiv by the end of 1944. Most of what was not evacuated was seized either during occupation or by the retreating Germans in the fall of 1943. While most of the art seized at the end of the war was subsequently destroyed in East Prussia in February 1945, newly discovered German inventories and increasing evidence of possible survivors make it more imperative than ever to document those seizures, which has never been done since the war.

Following Ukrainian independence, both those two Kyiv museums in the 1990s issued catalogues of their wartime losses, updating and correcting the immediate Soviet postwar reports of the Soviet Extraordinary State Commission on War Losses (ChGK), which were never published.9 In 1994, the Kyiv Museum of Russian Art listed over 800 paintings and ca. 350 icons, as well as watercolors, miniatures, and graphic works.10 A separate well-illustrated article by the compiler sketched out the wartime fate of the museum.11 In 1998 the Khanenko Museum (then still the Museum of Western and Oriental Art) listed 474 lost paintings (14th–19th cc.) in a better quality catalogue in English with scattered black and white illustrations.12 A more descriptive article followed in 2002.13

Unfortunately, the compilers of those publications did not have access to, or chose not to cite, many of the German documents on which the present article is based, most noticeably the German shipping crate inventories that provide initial lists for approximately half of the art seized by the invader from the two museums. Those inventories were also not discovered by German researchers working with the Soviet art-loss project at Bremen University in the early 1990s, as apparent in the unpublished report by Gabriele Freitag, which dealt with the subject of this paper emphasizing losses of Western European paintings.14 Even more unfortunate for Ukrainian researchers, many of the sources needed for research remain in Moscow; and despite the sensational opening of archives since 1991,

9 The full Russian name was the Extraordinary State Commission for the Establishment and Investigation of Crimes of the German-Fascist Aggressors and their Accomplices and for the Appraisal of the Losses Incurred by Citizens, Collective Farms, Social Organizations, State Enterprises, and Institutions of the USSR (ChGK). See my earlier discussion of the deficiencies of those reports in G rimsted Trophies of War and Empire, pp. 177–198. See the ChGK compilations for losses from the two museums below, notes 110 and 111.
10 Ladyzhenskaya Katalog proizvedenii Kievskogo muzeia russkogo iskusstva.
11 Pel’kina/Faktorovych Evakuatsiiia i hrabunok.
12 Roslavets’ (comp.) Catalogue of Works of Western European Painters.
13 Roslavets’ Kyïv’s’kyi muzei zakhidnoho i skhidnoho mystetstva.
Russia has been very slow – and now again retrograde – in opening many of the documents needed to tell the full story of wartime cultural losses and postwar retrievals and restitution. Yet even the documents in Moscow archives are not enough without utilization of archival resources abroad. Even if some of the Soviet sources are still under wraps, newly discovered documents in Moscow and abroad can now be meshed with German occupation records and shipping documents in Kyiv to reveal more about the losses of the two museums considered here.

The Museums under Occupation in Kyiv

When the Germans arrived in Kyiv in the fall of 1941, they had every intention of staying on and controlling the area as a source of manpower, food, and raw materials. Stalin had ordered scorched earth, and indeed the Germans were greeted by partisan mines throughout the city, the detonation of which left most of the city center in ruins, while mines remained in other historic buildings. Initially, the invaders had no plans to remove the art works found in Kyiv or destroy historic monuments.

Many German cultural operations in Kyiv were initially run by the Special Command Force of Reichsleiter Alfred Rosenberg known as the “Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg” (ERR), the major Nazi Party agency involved in wartime cultural plunder, quite apart from Rosenberg’s Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories (RMbO). In the early years of German occupation, the ERR and other German agencies seized comparatively few cultural treasures. Unlike on the Western Front, German agencies found none of the world-class private Jewish art collections that were their priority in France, Belgium, and the Netherlands. The Künsberg Batallions from the German Foreign Office were also at work finding trophies in the early year of the occupation. A few major collections of Jewish books and archives Künsberg and the ERR did find – nationalized in state repositories – were shipped West to join those from other parts of Europe in the Institute for Research on the Jewish Question (IEJ) in Frankfurt. Later in 1943, the ERR took a collection of “Bolshevik [i.e. socialist realism] art” for their anti-Bolshevik research center in Silesia, for example, and many prize collections of photographs, and also what was left of the Dnipropetrovsk Communist Party Archive and those from several other cities that the Soviets had been unable to evacuate or destroy in time. More significant and systematic seizure of art and archives from Ukraine, however, came only with the German retreat after Stalingrad in the fall of 1943. The focus then, as some German leaders claimed, was on

14 Freitag Erläuterungen zu der aktuellen ukrainischen Verlustliste des Kiewer Museums für westliche und östliche Kunst. I am grateful to Gabriele Freitag for making her unpublished report available to me, although we differ in some of our findings.

15 See Grimsted Introduction and the Ukrainian section in: Reconstructing the Record. The massive ERR records in Kyiv are now available on the Internet: “Kolleksiia dokumentov Operativnogo shtaba Rozenberga” (f. 3674 and f. 3676) on the TsDAVO website: http://err.tsdavo.org.ua (15 Jan. 2013). See KASHENKHOVA/MALOLETOVA. Deiatel’nost’ operativnogo shtaba Reikhsliaitera Rozenberga; descriptions from that volume serve as links to the digitized documents on the TsDAVO website.

16 Hartung Das Sonderkommando Künsberg.

17 Many removals from Ukraine, particularly books and archives, are described in Grimsted Trophies of War and Empire. For the role of the ERR, see also Grimsted Roads to Ratibor.
saving cultural treasures in state museums from the anticipated ferocity and devastation of the Red Army ‘liberation’ of Ukraine.

Many of the art objects and museum exhibits seized under ERR auspices from Ukrainian museums were transported west via Cracow and ended the war, together with some of their Ukrainian curators, in the major art repositories run by the ERR in Bavaria, notably the Monastery of Buxheim and the Castle of Höchstädt for treasures from the East. Most of those were indeed saved after the war by American Museum Fine Arts & Archives (MFA&A) officers and processed for restitution to the USSR at the Munich Central Collecting Point (MCCP) under OMGUS (US Office of Military Government for Germany). Although Soviet authorities at the time, and some Russian politicians still today, claim that nothing was returned from the West, American authorities could document that of 534,120 items restituted to the USSR by September 1948, at least 167,717 items were from Kyiv. The Americans often had difficulty identifying the items of Ukrainian provenance, but despite requests and advice of Soviet specialists, SVAG authorities did not permit Ukrainian specialists who had been sent to Berlin to visit MCCP to help. Many of those cultural valuables from Ukraine that were found by the US, even when turned over to Soviet authorities, never returned to Ukraine.

A Russian analyst recently explained that when specialists at the suburban Leningrad collecting point for cultural treasures returned from abroad requested Ukrainian specialists to come and assist identification in Pushkin and Pavlovsk and provide funds for shipping, there was no reply, and some Ukrainian valuables were transferred to the general Soviet Museum Fond. Given the difficult postwar years, cultural restitution was not a high Soviet priority, and Ukraine lacked staff and funding for that particular retrieval mission. While other items retrieved from the West were returned to Kyiv in 1948 and subsequently, it is unlikely that any paintings from the two Kyiv museums under consideration here were returned to the Pushkin center. Soviet authorities had earlier sent claims with lists of lost art from those two Kyiv museums to Western restitution authorities and complained bitterly that Western Allies did not return Soviet art objects, including those from

18 See the summary description and maps of the seizure routes from Kyiv by Freitag/Grenzer. Der Nationalsozialistische Kunstraub in der Sowjetunion, pp. 20–66, and maps on pp. 104–105 (Buxheim), and pp. 108–109 (Höchstädt).
21 This is documented by Kot, especially his most recent Amerykans’ka polityka restyutusii, pp. 251–252. See also Kot’s earlier compendium, Ukraina’s’ki kul’turni tsnostii v Rosii. Zinizh includes the letter of request from Kuchumov to Kyiv cultural authorities (1 April 1948) that went unanswered.
Kyiv museums.\textsuperscript{23} However, they apparently were not aware that they had captured many of the related German documents, and failed to investigate thoroughly the tragic destruction of the art and icons shipped to East Prussia under orders from Reich Commissar of Ukraine Erich Koch.

Reichsleiter Alfred Rosenberg, as Reichsminister of the Occupied Eastern [i.e. Soviet] Territories, somewhat against his will appointed Erich Koch (Fig. 3) as Reich Commissar of Ukraine, but the running dispute between the two continued throughout the war; Rosenberg often complained to the Führer about many of Koch’s policies and his brutality, but usually to no avail.\textsuperscript{24} Although the Reich Commissariat of Ukraine was headquartered in Rivne (Rus. Rovno), during the war Koch spent much more time in the Königsberg region, where he held forth as Nazi Gauleiter (since 1928) and Oberpräsident of East Prussia (since 1934) until its capture by the Red Army in the winter of 1945.\textsuperscript{25} He set himself up on an impressive estate with his ‘palace’ outside of Königsberg, constructed with all the trappings of the high Nazi elite, including a hunting lodge and seaside ‘dacha’, all with steel-lined secret underground bunkers, and to be sure his own personal collection of art and amber. A number of choice pieces of art from the two Kyiv museums under consideration were destined for Erich Koch’s personal collection in Königsberg, part of which he succeeded in evacuating to Germany at the end of the war.

\textsuperscript{23} Soviet claims submitted to the Western Allies remain in both Soviet and Western Allied restitution records, but the Soviet files discovered several years ago within the records of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade (RGAE, f. 413, opis’ 16) have now been reclassified in Moscow. Further investigation of this matter is in progress.

\textsuperscript{24} See the explanation of the Rosenberg-Koch duel by \textsc{Dallin}, \textit{German Rule in Russia}, especially pp. 84–85 and 123–151.

\textsuperscript{25} Regarding Koch’s exploits in East Prussia, see especially \textsc{Meindl}, \textit{Ostpreußens Gauleiter}, and \textsc{Führer/Schön}, \textit{Erich Koch}.
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None of the paintings Koch chose for his personal collection from Ukrainian museums have returned to Ukraine. Before following their trail and the fate of the Koch Collection in a sequel, the present article focuses on the more significant art from Ukrainian museums shipped under Koch’s orders to East Prussia and then destroyed when the Red Army arrived as conqueror in Koch’s ‘homeland.’

Under German occupation, those museums were initially under Municipal Administration. In 1942 the two museums were combined as divisions of the German-reorganized Kyiv Provincial Museum (Landesmuseum Kiew), which in December came under administration of the newly established Provincial Authority for Archives, Libraries and Museums (Landesverwaltung für Archive, Bibliotheken und Museen – LV ABM) under the Reich Commissariat of Ukraine, headed by Erich Koch.

The LV ABM took over many staff and shared some cultural operations with the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg (ERR), but it was responsible to Koch rather than Rosenberg. It was directed by the noted professional Prussian archivist Georg Winter (Fig. 4), who earlier headed ERR operations in Ukraine after he arrived in Kyiv in October 1941. Winter simultaneously served the Reichsarchiv, based in Potsdam and Berlin-Dahlem, and before coming to Ukraine, he had organized the Reichsarchiv operations in Paris. Many of the administrative records of the LV ABM were retrieved in the fall of 1945 by Ukrainian archival scouts in what is now the Czech city of Opava (Ger. Troppau), the last site of LV ABM operation in what had been part of the Sudetenland during the war. To head the Kyiv Provincial Museum during occupation, Winter took on two dissident Ukrainian art historians who had fallen out of favor with the Soviet regime.

A sequel analyzing the fate of the private art collection of Erich Koch is in preparation: GRIEMSTED Amber and Old Masters from East and West: Initial Findings on the Erich Koch Collection from Königsberg.

Georg Winter (1895–1961) held the hybrid title as of May 1942, “Beauftragter des Generaldirektors der Staatsarchive und des Kommissars für Archivschutz beim Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg – Hauptarbeitsgruppe Ukraine.” After the war he became the first president of Bundesarchiv (BArch) in Koblenz in 1949. Regarding Winter’s archival activities in Ukraine with the ERR and the LV ABM, see LEHR Ein fast vergessener “Osteinsatz,” especially pp. 182–227. See also the lengthy obituary of Winter by Wilhelm Rohr in: Der Archivar 14 (1961), 3, cols. 179–190. Winter’s personal papers in the Bundesarchiv Koblenz do not pertain to his activities in Ukraine, but some of his personal correspondence is found in the LV ABM files in TsDAVO, f. 3206, opys 5.

Remaining LV ABM records are the fifth series (opys 5) of the fond for the Reichskommissariat Ukraine (f. 3206) in TsDAVO, now available on the Internet with the ERR Collection: http://err.tsdao.org.ua (15 Jan. 2013), as described in GRIEMSTED Reconstructing the Record. See also DUBYK Arkhivna sprava v okupovani Ukraïni with a list of many LV ABM files. See also DUBYK Skhema sprav Kraiovoho upravlennia.
Polina Kul’zhenko (Fig. 15)

Ukrainian art historian, professor, and museum curator Polina Kul’zhenko had worked in the Russian Museum until 1936, when she was fired in the purge of Ukrainian intellectuals. Initially, the Gestapo had questioned her about her Jewish background, but she was able to convince them that she was confirmed in the Orthodox Church in 1912 and listed as “Ukrainian” in her passport. The Germans needed her expertise in Ukrainian culture and her fluent German, although her father was shot, presumably in Babi Yar. She was delighted to resume museum work under the Germans and anxious to care for the treasures of that museum. She willingly served under Winter as the director of the Division for East European Art, as the Kyiv Museum of Russian Art was reorganized. Under Winter’s recommendation and Koch’s orders, the Germans took Kul’zhenko with them to catalogue and look after the extensive plundered art when they retreated from Kyiv in the fall of 1943.

Serhii Hiliarov (Rus. Giliarov) (Fig. 5)

The devoted Ukrainian art historian and senior curator Serhii Hiliarov (Rus. Giliarov) had served as a deputy director of what became the Museum of Western and Oriental Art from 1923 until his arrest in 1933. Parallel to the case of Kul’zhenko, as an outcast from Soviet museum work in the late 1930s, he willingly resumed work at German request and served as director of the Division for West European Art. Like Kul’zhenko, he did his utmost to protect and account for the...
holdings during occupation. As a reward he was arrested and imprisoned as a collaborator; he died in KGB captivity during interrogation in 1946. Since Ukrainian independence he has been rehabilitated, with a 2002 symposium devoted to his memory.32

‘Borrowed Art’

Soon after arrival in Kyiv German authorities started removing exhibits from both museums “on loan” for offices and living quarters of the occupation elite (e.g. Figs. 6 and 7). Fifteen copies of original German receipts for ‘borrowed art’ from the Museum of Western and Oriental Art were found in Moscow in 1990/91, among the records of the Extraordinary State Commission on War Losses (ChGK); copies were prepared for the Kyiv museum.33 They list art objects removed together with the museum registration numbers, which can be meshed with notations in a prewar inventory register held today by the Khanenko Museum.34 For example, on 26 November 1941, four paintings were signed out for the “Casino” of the General Commissariat; and a month later (20 December 1941), eleven paintings and several large vases were taken for the lodgings of the General Commissar in Kyiv. Four paintings were removed for the apartment of Brigade Commander Haltermann on 10 March 1942, including a landscape by Courbet, an Italian landscape, and a “View of the Naples Harbor” by Carlo

32 The proceedings from the memorial conference on the 115th anniversary of Hiliarov’s birth were published by the Khanenko Museum as an issue of its series, Khanenkov’ski chytannia, vyp. 4.
33 GA RF, f. 7021 (ChGK)/116/250, fols. 52–62. Hennadii Boriak and I first found these documents in Moscow in 1990 and ordered copies for transfer to Kyiv. They were mentioned by Tetiana Sebta at the 1994 conference in Chernihiv: Sëbta Ukrain’s’ki muzei pid chas okupatsii.
34 Khanenko Museum, “Inventar muzeiu mystetstv Vseukraïns’koï Akademiï nauk, 1–2476.” Notes on a right-hand column document borrowings during the war and items recorded in the official Act of Loss (Akt ushcherba).
Another 41 paintings were seized in March 1942, also signed for by the General Commissar in Kyiv. Corresponding notations in the museum registration books in Kyiv bear witness to “borrowings” of at least 78 seventeenth–eighteenth century Dutch, Flemish, and Italian paintings and 65 pieces of antique furniture, most of which were never returned.

The last named March 1942 list of seizures is of particular interest because a number of the paintings listed were taken by the Germans to Königsberg. At least three named paintings coincide with those appearing on a list found in Weimar for that portion of Erich Koch’s personal collection that he managed to evacuate from Königsberg to Germany in February 1945. Two paintings on the same March list were recovered in the 1970s from a museum in Perm, having surfaced in Königsberg after the war, where they were acquired and taken home by Soviet Army officers.

German documents likewise provide details of other items “borrowed” from the Kyiv Museum of Russian Art. Receipts remain, for example, for 17 paintings “borrowed” by the General Commissariat in Kyiv, and for 24 objects in bronze and ceramic. That is only one of several remaining. Unfortunately, the German original receipts in Moscow are now reclassified, but copies were acquired from another Moscow archive. Koch issued an order on the 19th of March 1942 to stop the “borrowing process.” Some 16 individual receipts for “borrowed” art were found preserved in Kul’zhenko’s KGB

35 GA RF, f. 7021/116/250; those cited are from folios 55, 56, 62, 59 and 60. The “copy” of the list of 41 paintings is not dated, but the entries correspond with museum registration book notations for removal 23 Mar. 1942.

36 ROSLAVETS’ Kyïv’s’kyi muzei zakhidnoho i skhidnoho mystetstva, p. 89.

37 A copy of a German 1945 list was published by WERMUSCH Die Bernsteinzimmer-Saga, pp. 145–151. Wermusch served with the Stasi investigation of the Amber Chamber. Although not so attributed, the original is in Weimar with copies in the Stasi Archive. See also the website http://www.amberroom.org/ (15 Jan. 2013).

38 See more details about these two paintings below, notes 101 and 102; both are now back in the Khanenko Museum.

39 GA RF, f. A-659/2/46, fols. 138–147; regarding the collection of Commission records constituting f. A-659, see below note 94 and the related text on page 73. Those copies are from TsGALI (now RGALI), f. 962/6/ 1180; the originals in RGALI could not be verified because that series (opis’ 6) of f. 962, previously declassified, has been closed to public access in 2011–2012. Most of the lists and receipts for “borrowed” objects from the Museum of East European-Russian Art are signed by Kul’zhenko as director. Some details about such loans are reported by Bentzing to Jantke, 11 Apr. 1942, TsDAVO, 3296/5/4, fol. 561. See additional details about removals from the museums during July, fols. 575 (cc folio 576 and 645).
file in Kyiv, with notes indicating that nine of the objects were returned in April and seven in July.\textsuperscript{40}

Clearly the borrowing process did not stop, however, with later examples even by Koch himself. After his visit to the Russian Museum later in the summer of 1942, a receipt remains for a painting of a Ukrainian “Maiden in Peasant Dress” (\textit{sarafan}), “borrowed” for Commissar Erich Koch personally (Figs. 6 and 7).\textsuperscript{41} That painting is still missing, but it is not listed on remaining inventories of the Koch Collection evacuated to Weimar in 1945. Koch may not have had any respect for Ukrainians, but he evidently did like Ukrainian young ladies, at least in paintings.

Of special importance, all remaining receipts for “borrowed” items now need to be analyzed more carefully, collated with museum records, and published accordingly, because the items recorded, at least those that were not returned to the museums before the German departure, turn out to be the items that are most likely to have survived the war, and may still be at large.

ERR senior specialist Dr. Diedrich Roskamp, who was sent to Kyiv to examine museums in May 1942, commented on the “borrowing” process in his postwar interrogation by the British. At that point the Western Division of the museum was open only to Wehrmacht officers and other high German officials. Roskamp met both Kul’zhenko and Hiliarov in Kyiv and claimed to have endeavored to get the museums reopened to the public and have the “borrowed” art returned. Koch’s deputy in Kyiv had consented to reopen the museums and agreed to the return of the paintings, but during Roskamp’s meeting with the Reich Commissariat, Koch declared, “Reopening the museums was out of the question.” Roskamp heard from Kul’zhenko that Koch had “again authorized loans of pictures.”\textsuperscript{42} Some of the German reports on museum operations during 1942 and 1943, at least in part prepared by Kul’zhenko, remain among the LV ABM files in Kyiv; others are preserved among museum records.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{40} HDA SBU, f. 6/74305 fp., vol. 2, the German slips, together with slips in Ukrainian translation attached, were enclosed in a loose envelope at the end of the second volume, when I examined that file in July 2011. However, a colleague from the Russian Museum in Kyiv recently reported the archive was unable to provide copies of the contents of that envelope, although they kindly provided copies of the rest of the file, because the envelope could not be located.

\textsuperscript{41} A German receipt (4 July 1942) lists this painting with registration no. 1872 by an unknown artist from the Vinnytsia region from the first half of the 19th century with dimensions of 98 x 80 in good condition: GA RF, f. A-659/2/46, fol. 147; that seizure was noted without details in the introduction to \textit{Ladyzhenskaya [et al.]} \textit{Katalog proizvedenii Kievskogo muzeia russkogo iskusstva}, p. 5.


\textsuperscript{43} TsDAVO, 3206/5/12, for example fols. 176–184, 307–317.
Icons from the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra

During occupation, the Germans significantly reshuffled exhibits among various museums in Kyiv, a fact that now greatly complicates compilation of data about removals and losses. Most significant was the transfer of icons, which had not been a high priority art form under Soviet rule, and most of which the Soviets had not bothered to evacuate from Kyiv. In fact many valuable ones from Ukraine had been sold abroad under the First Five-Year Plan, to say nothing of earlier seizures. Head curator of what is today the UNESCO-protected National Kyiv-Pechersk Historical Cultural Preserve, Hryhorii Poliushko, has compiled significant data about their fate over several decades, but he still remains hampered by lack of adequate documentation about specific sales and seizures.44 Before the war the Museum of Russian Art had registered only 56 icons, while a few from the Khakenko Collection remained in the museum next door. Reportedly a total of only 60 icons were evacuated to Ufa.

The most important icon collections in Kyiv remained in the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, many of which had been relegated to secret storage, while some were held in the Central Museum of Atheism established in one of the Lavra buildings. When the ERR discovered

44 Poliushko kindly consulted with me about the transfer of icons during the war and subsequent retrievals. He told me that, unfortunately, prewar inventory books were lost during the war, which makes it exceedingly difficult to match Russian Museum accession numbers for icons used in the German wartime shipping inventories with earlier registration numbers. His published study regarding lost treasures from the Lavra only mentions icons in passing: Poliushko Vtracheni skarby Lavrs’koho muzeiu.
that some of the buildings in the Lavra had been mined, they moved many of the icons to a school building further from the city center, and some were moved elsewhere. German ordnance specialists succeeded in removing dynamite from one building in the Lavra, and cleared many cultural valuables from others by November 1941, when they attempted unsuccessfully to remove mines from the Assumption (Ospens’kyi) Cathedral. Its destruction remains a lasting symbol of German atrocities in Kyiv, although the real cause remains disputed (most probably Soviet mines). ERR museum specialist Diedrich Roskamp suggested in his postwar testimony, “In a school near KIEW he found a lot of icons and other works of art which had been collected from the monastery of LAVRA pending transfer to Germany. … He arranged for them to be housed in the Ost-European Museum.”

A series of transfers of icons is confirmed by entries in a surviving acquisition register in the Russian Museum starting in mid-October 1942, indicating the Lavra as source, while another series in February 1943 records more icons and religious paintings received from the ERR. By early 1943, the number of icons in the Russian Museum had grown to at least 350 with the German transfer of 294 icons from the Lavra, and then more were received from other sources, raising the total to a reported 570 icons. Kul’zhenko, as a specialist in icons, recognized some from the world-famous collection of Porfirii Uspenskii, described in prerevolutionary publication

![Image](https://example.com/image.jpg)

**Fig. 9: Icon: Saint Paraskeva Friday, 15th century, Novgorod School, inventory no. Zh-225. © Image courtesy of the National Museum of Russian Art, Kyiv.**

45 This matter is documented in GRIMSTED Trophies of War and Empire, pp. 186–188; a retrospective report by Dr. Dieter Roskamp to ERR-Berlin, 15 July 1942, details the removal of dynamite from the Historical Museum in the Lavra.

46 “Resume of the Interrogation of Dr Diedrich ROSKAMP,” fol. 204.

47 Kyiv Museum of Russian Art, Inventarnia kniga – Kniga postuplenii, 1939–1948. Most fall within the registration numbers Zh 216–Zh 789, suggesting there were over 500 acquisitions, with some suggestions of as many as 600. Hryhorii Poliushko cites the number of 294 from the Central Museum of Atheism in the Lavra. Apparently some received from the ERR came via the school mentioned by Roskamp. But given the brief entries with lack of previous registration numbers, full provenance details are impossible to trace for many of them. I am grateful to the head curators in the Russian Museum and the Lavra for explaining details involved and letting me examine the registers. Further coordinated efforts are needed to ascertain better identification, but presumably almost all the icons were destroyed, as explained below.
from the Church-Archeological Museum under the Kiev Theological Academy. One of the oldest and most sacred was the Ihorivs’ka icon of the Mother of God from the Assumption Cathedral in the Lavra (Fig. 10), by then in ruins. As will be explained below, all of the icons from the Russian Museum were evacuated by the Germans to Königsberg. According to wartime reports, an additional 567 icons and paintings were transferred to what is now the Museum of Ukrainian Art, but those were evacuated under ERR auspices further West by the Germans to ERR depositories in Bavaria. Most of them were then restituted to the USSR from the US Zone in Germany, but not all of those were returned to Kyiv.

First Stop: Kamianets'-Podilskyi

When the Germans retreated from Kyiv in September and October 1943, Winter seized some 80 crates of art and icons from those two Kyiv museums, together with many more archives from state repositories, and he also took a few crates of rare books from the Library of the Academy of Sciences. Winter enticed Polina Kul’zhenko to accompany the shipment by warning her that the museum building would be mined with the German departure, and undoubtedly would be destroyed by the Red Army recapture of Kyiv. Hiliarov was forced to carry out the German packing orders for the West European Division. Thanks to his diligence, German shipping lists have been found for five crates containing first priority art (65 paintings and 38 frames) that were sent by truck to RKU headquarters in Rivne on the 16th of September.

Winter was able to secure only two freight wagons for transport to his designated evacua-

Fig. 10: Ihorivs’ka Icon of the Mother of God, from the Assumption Cathedral in the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, 12th century, inventory no. Zh-280. © Image courtesy of the Museum of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra.

48 KUL’ZHENKO Spomyn (in: BLOKIN’ Hirky spohad), p. 150. See, for example, PETROV Al’bom dostoprimechatel’nosti Tserkovno-arkheologicheskogo muzeia.

49 See the recent study of this icon by POLUSHKO Ihorivs’ka ikona Bozhoi Materi. The icon is listed in the Russian Museum catalogue of losses with registration no. Zh-280. See also BENTCHEV Zur Ikone “Entschlafen der Gottesmutter,” with illustrations of several icons from the Lavra, including the Ihorivs’ka (Igor) icon of the Mother of God.

50 See the Report (Bericht) of the Landesmuseum Kiew for 1943, probably prepared by Kul’zenko, who was also serving as director of the Ukrainian Museum for at least part of the year, LV ABM, f. 3206/5/20, fols. 26, and 113.

51 That explanation had not figured in her “Spomyn,” but she recounted it in an interview with the head of the Kaliningrad investigatory commission, M.I. Popova (18–19 April 1972), GA RF, f. A-659/2/44, fol. 194.
tion point in Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi. For the East European (Russian) Division Kul’zhenko supervised the packing and preparation of inventories for 15 crates of exhibits – 9 crates with icons and 6 with paintings. Item-level shipping lists for the art removed from both museums are still preserved in Moscow. Winter left on the 22nd of September, accompanied by Kul’zhenko together with her elderly housekeeper. Included were ten priority crates “of the first category” from the West European Division of the Museum with 43 paintings and 4 ancient statues (2 Roman marble busts, and 2 sculptures in bronze – one from Egypt and the other from Pompeii). The largest part of the transport was the priority holdings from the Kyiv Archive of Early Acts, consisting in the earliest record books from the Polish period, some with municipal charters granting rights of Magdeburg Law and related documentation that was to exemplify the early German influence in Ukraine and justify the policy of Drang nach Osten, the drive to the East of the Nazi regime.

Winter set up the Provincial Authority (LV ABM) in the building of the Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi Oblast Archive. The crates of art were deposited in the Turkish fortress, where Polina Kul’zhenko was to work on the inventories.

Winter returned to Kyiv, remaining until the 21st of October, and was able to commandeer another five freight wagons for cultural evacuations. That second larger transport from Kyiv included one and a half wagons of art from the Western Division, including engravings, as well as more from the East European Division. There was no possibility of preparing crate inventories before shipment: for the Western Division, Hiliarov was not available, and for the Eastern Division, Kul’zhenko was already in Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi. As Winter wrote Reichsarchiv Director Zipfel at the end of October, “security of cultural goods in Kyiv was no longer possible.” Earlier, he had seen “no reason to evacuate more Ukrainian archives, libraries, and museums … since those should remain with their institutions in the region. Only very special archives and politically important materials would have been an exception. […] But because of the way the war is being...
conducted,” he wrote, “there is a danger that these cultural goods would be destroyed by mines, by burning, and by plunder.” Personally, he admitted, he “had deep scruples about having to take them out of Ukraine.”

By the 8th of November Winter was reporting 80 crates of art from the two Kyiv museums in Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi. One of the wagons containing important Kyiv archival materials and also six crates of museum exhibits from Poltava was hijacked in Vinnytsia and ransacked, arriving in Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi only on the 25th of November.

Among the archives brought to Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi, those Winter deemed most important were evacuated in December further West to Troppau (now Czech Opava), where during the final years of the war the German Reichsarchiv had established a center for archives evacuated from the Eastern Front. Ironically, most of those Kyiv archives that the Germans took to Troppau and then to a castle in western Bohemia were found by the American Third Army and returned to Ukraine in October 1945. Those left behind in Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi and Troppau were found by Ukrainian archival scouts in the summer of 1945. Those the Germans left behind in Kyiv, however, disappeared and/or perished during the Red Army recapture in October–November 1943.

Destination East Prussia

Under orders from Erich Koch at the end of 1943, the art shipped from the two Kyiv museums to both Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi and Rivne was redirected to Königsberg. Dates and details of the shipment of the five crates with 65 paintings from Rivne to Königsberg have not been found, although we know the contents of those five crates. We know that at least part of the Rivne shipment arrived safely and was destined for Koch’s personal art collection. At least four paintings by nineteenth-century German artists from Crate I and possibly a Dutch seventeenth-century painting by Godfried Schalcken from Crate II coincide with listings from part of Koch’s collection that was evacuated to Germany in February 1945. It has not been determined, however, if all the rest of the five crates sent via Rivne were reunited in Königsberg with the 78 crates of art from Kyiv sent via Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi.

57 Winter to Zipfel, Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi, 26 Oct. 1943, TsDAVO, 3206/5/9, fols. 163–165.
58 Winter to RKU, 8 Nov. 1943, TsDAVO, 3206/5/9, fol. 205, among others.
59 Winter, “Aktenvermerk,” Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi, 29 Nov. 1943, TsDAVO, 3206/5/8, fols. 165–166 (facsimile in GRIMSTED Dolia tsinostei, pp. 72–73); Winter to SA Potsdam, 1 Dec. 1943, TsDAVO, 3206/5/8, fols. 191–192. The eventual fate and further disposition of the Poltava museum exhibits is not indicated, but they were not listed with the art from Kyiv shipped on to Königsberg.
60 See GRIMSTED The Fate of the Kyiv Central Archive of Early Acts.
61 Those listed in Crate I from Kyiv to Rivne that appear to coincide with the German list from Weimar are: no. 3 – Abregarde [or Abrahul], “Geflügelhof” (reg. no. 6784); no. 7 – Friederich Hildebrandt, “Kinder am Strand” (reg. no. 6784); no. 8 – Franz Winterhalder, “Brustbild eines Knaben” (reg. no. 3706); no. 10 – Andreas Achenbach, “Barkassen am Pier” (reg. no. 6560). One of the Weimar lists notes that the Schalcken bears markings from a Kyiv museum; however a question remains, because the title on the Weimar list is “Spitzenkläpplerin” (The Lace-maker), while the only Schalcken missing from Kyiv was entitled “The Game of Cards” (reg. no. 6775), and the dimensions in the two listings also differ.
Two railroad wagons were dispatched from Kamianets'-Podil's'kyi on the 11th of December, accompanied by Winter’s deputy Dr. Benzing. A thief tried unsuccessfully to break into one of the wagons in Brest, and Benzing complained about having to wait 40 hours but explained, he “would have had to wait longer if he hadn’t had some vodka.” They arrived in Königsberg on the 19th of December. Those crates were undoubtedly opened in Königsberg before Kul’zhenko arrived in mid-January, but no record has been found of how many paintings might have been removed before the crates were sent out to the estate where she was to look after them. Some of those paintings may also have gone to Koch’s personal collection, or intended for other purposes. Apparently at least one painting was removed at some point from the number one crate from Kyiv (via Kamianets'-Podil’s’kyi) and has recently surfaced in Western Europe, but further investigation is still underway.

Following receipt of RKU orders on the 4th of January 1944, Kul’zhenko was dispatched via Troppau to Königsberg, arriving there on the 14th of January with the remaining crates of art from the two Kyiv museums. Winter sent a glowing recommendation for her as a specialist in East European art and icons to the Central Procurement Office of the RKU in Königsberg. The information was presumably intended for well-known German art historian and amber specialist Alfred Rohde (1892–1945), who directed the Königsberg museums and art treasures brought to East Prussia. Of special importance to Rohde, the Amber Chamber had arrived there in the fall of 1941 on Koch’s orders and was already on exhibit triumphantly in Königsberg Castle. Rohde was thenceforward also in charge of the art from Kyiv and Kul’zhenko’s work in East Prussia.

Kul’zhenko, together with 78 crates of art from Kyiv, was first housed 70 kilometers east of Königsberg on the Richau family estate – Staatsdomäne Richau (Rus. Tel’manovo), 7 km from Wehlau (now Rus. Znamensk). She telegraphed her arrival there to Winter 18 January and later wrote on the 20th to another Ukrainian from Kyiv (volksdeutsch librarian Fal’kevich) whom Winter had also taken with him to Troppau, and she wrote to Winter on the 1st of February. In Richau Kul’zhenko continued work with the treasures from Ukrainian museums, especially the valuable icons.

---


63 A separate report is underway, but details are not being revealed pending further negotiations.


65 Winter to Central Procurement Office RKU in Königsberg, 9 Jan. 1944, TsDAVO, 3206/5/8, fols. 143–143 v.


In a memorandum to the RKU office in Königsberg dated 29 January 1944, Winter summarized the contents for a total of 78 crates that were sent from Kamianets-Podil’skyi via Troppau from the two divisions of the Kyiv Museum. He explained that he was enclosing inventories for a total of 47 crates from the Kyiv museums, which Kul’zhenko had prepared, and that Kul’zhenko would be preparing inventories for the remaining crates. Lacking for the West European Division are inventories for an additional 13 crates of paintings (W 1–13) Winter reported sent to Königsberg, and an additional 18 crates for the East European Division.

**A. from the Kyiv Provincial Museum – West European Division [now Khanenko Museum]**

(a) crates MW 1–11 (total = 47 paintings, 13 sculptures; 26 Oriental figurines):
- crates MW 1 – MW 7 (47 paintings)
- crates MW 8 – MW 9, each with one 2nd-c. Roman marble sculpture
- crate MW 10–11 bronze figures
- crate MW 11–26 Oriental and glass figurines.
- crates W 1–13 (no inventories)

(b) 21 large and 30 small cartons (engravings); 6 packets, and one roll (engravings).

**B. from the Kyiv Provincial Museum – East European Division [now Russian Museum]**

(total = 646 paintings; 320 icons; 11 miniatures; 11 watercolors):

(a) crates MO 1 – MO 15 J (196 icons; 11 19th c. watercolors)

(b) crates MO 1 – 6 B (132 paintings)

(c) crates O 1 – O 33 (with gaps for those with no inventories)
- crates O 1 – O 7, O 10 – O 12 = 506 paintings;
- crates O 14 (icons, nos. 1–46; plus no. 47, 17th c. Flemish painting)
- crates O 16 (icons, nos. 1–41; and miniatures, nos. 42–58)
- crates O 18 (icons, nos. 1–25); O 22 (icons, nos. 1–8)
- crates O 32 (paintings, nos. 1–8); O 33 (icons, nos. 1–4).

Copies of the 47 inventories sent with the shipments from Kamianets-Podil’skyi (via Troppau) are not found among the LV ABM records in Kyiv, but quite surprisingly, original carbon copies have surfaced among US Nuremberg (IMT) records – curiously thanks to Dr. Köhlbach, Troppau, 29 Jan. 1944, TsDAVO, 3206/5/8, fols. 120–121 (facsimile in GRIMSTED Dolia tsnostei, pp. 74–75). He lists the crate numbers covered in the inventories, although copies of the referenced inventories are not preserved with the outgoing copy in the LV ABM files in Kyiv. Winter’s handwritten draft is in fols. 117–118 v. Cf. the later discussion below of the 65 inventories referenced in the Sep. 1944 document (USSR-372; 055-PS) presented at Nuremberg.

68 Winter to RKU (Dr. Köhlbach), Troppau, 29 Jan. 1944, TsDAVO, 3206/5/8, fols. 120–121 (facsimile in GRIMSTED Dolia tsnostei, pp. 74–75). He lists the crate numbers covered in the inventories, although copies of the referenced inventories are not preserved with the outgoing copy in the LV ABM files in Kyiv. Winter’s handwritten draft is in fols. 117–118 v. Cf. the later discussion below of the 65 inventories referenced in the Sep. 1944 document (USSR-372; 055-PS) presented at Nuremberg.

69 The content lists of those 11 crates are cited here from digitized copies of NG-4353 from the US microfilm, and coincide with the copies from Potsdam in GA RF, f. A-659/2/48, fols. 13–18 (German original with Russian translation). Those Part I listings are lacking in the three copies of USSR-372/055-PS examined in GA RF (see note 108).

70 SSSR-372/055-PS, in the official Soviet records of the Nuremberg Tribunal (IMT), GA RF, f. 7445/2/125, fols. 164–204; and 7445/2/138, fols. 311–348. The negative photostats from the German originals are now badly faded and some are out of order. The lists correspond with the Part II listings in the NG-4353 version in NACP and on the US microfilms.
to printouts in another Moscow archive from US microfilms in Potsdam (East German Central State Archive). In her memoir written when she was awaiting trial back in Kyiv Oblast in 1946, Kul’zhenko describes a monograph, qua catalogue, she was preparing about the East Slavic icons, with six chapters devoted to different icon schools.\(^7\) The fate of that manuscript is unknown. She says nothing about having prepared additional inventories; her indications of 320 icons survive in the inventories she prepared for the Germans that Winter had sent with the Kam”ianets’-Podil’s’kyi shipment.

A surviving July 1944 German report addressed to the Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories in Berlin referenced a total of 85 wooden crates from Kyiv and Kharkiv that were then located on the estates of Richau and Wildenhoff with attached inventories for 65 crates. At that point Kul’zhenko would still have been in Richau, and all other references found to date suggest only the 78 crates from Kyiv were there. The only original German carbon copy of the July report found so far, however, preserved with US Nuremberg records in College Park, MD, has only 47 rather than 65 crate lists attached.\(^7\) In fact, the crate lists attached to the German original (and other surviving copies) of the July 1944 report all coincide exactly with the 47 crate inventories that Winter listed in January as having been sent with the 78 crates from Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi to Königsberg.\(^7\) If any more inventories were prepared in East Prussia, none have surfaced.

The July version of that East Ministry (RMBo) report has an important paragraph with timely recommendations for further evacuation of the art from East Prussia:

“[…] since in Richau there is only a woman custodian of the Kiev museum constantly near the collections, proper supervision and safeguarding in the present situation is not possible. […] Immediate storage in the Reich appears to be desirable, suggested in Central or Southern Germany. Furthermore it is necessary to have the inventories checked and continued by a German expert and to have photographs made.”\(^7\)

If those Berlin recommendations reached Königsberg, they were never followed. The art in East Prussia was under Koch’s control, and neither Koch nor Rohde were suggesting evacuation to central Germany. Significantly, the paragraph with those recommendations

72 Chief of Directing Group [Goepel] P 4 (Führungsgruppe P 4, Kulturfragen) to the Reich Minister [Rosenberg], Berlin, July 1944, NG-4353 (a), NARA Microfilm Publication T1139/roll 44, presumably corresponding to the originals in the official US Nuremberg records in NACP, RG 238 (Collection of World War II War Crimes Records of the Office of the US Chief Counsel for the Prosecution of Axis Criminality). The memoranda also appear in the original German on the same microfilm; a printout from the copy in the East German State Archive in Potsdam, and also the later Russian translation of NG-4353 are in GA RF, f. A-659/2/48, fol. 155.
73 The 47 crate-list inventories are entitled “Verzeichnis der aus dem Landesmuseum Kiew nach Kamenez-Podolsk verbrachten und nach Königsberg weitergeleiteten Kunstgegenstände.” The NG-4353 designation is penciled at the top of the initial page of inventories; subsequent pages bear typewritten numbers through p. 9, and penciled numbers 4–11 under the NG-4353 designation. The paper original in NACP is in RG 238, Entry 70, box 83, now normally available to researchers on NARA Microfilm Publication T1139/roll 44.
74 Chief of Directing Group to the Reich Minister [Rosenberg], Berlin, July 1944, NG-4353 (a), p. 1, NARA Microfilm Publication T1139/roll 44. The initial paragraphs of that July report characterizing the Ukrainian collections were repeated in the 12 and 14 Sep. memoranda within the Ministry in Berlin (and later used as the Soviet exhibit USSR-372/055-PS – see below), but the quoted paragraph was not included.
is missing in a later September 1944 version of that report (otherwise identical) that was forwarded to Alfred Rosenberg as Reich Minister. The September version of the July 1944 document, a copy of which was prepared by the US as Nuremberg Document 055-PS, was later submitted as a Soviet Exhibit against Rosenberg in the International Military Tribunal (IMT) in Nuremberg (see below), but without that paragraph suggesting evacuation or referring to Kul’zhenko.75

Kul’zhenko remained in Richau with the 78 crates of art until November 1944. When the Red Army was closing in on East Prussia, she made her way into Königsberg to appeal to Rohde, and he came out to Richau with trucks on 13 November to move the 78 crates and Kul’zhenko.76

Kul’zhenko’s next home was the impressive baroque palace on the von Schwerin estate of Wildenhoff (now Polish Dzikowo Ilaweckie), 70 km south of Königsberg (Fig. 11).77 Rohde had been in contact with the von Schwerin family and arranged to use their palace to store the evacuated art. Kul’zhenko was well received by Countess Esther von Schwerin (1904–1985), whose husband had been called to the front.78 Unless Rohde had lost a sense of geography or was only thinking of aerial attacks after the British bombing of Königsberg in August and September of 1944, it is hard to imagine why he would have chosen to move the captured art to Wildenhoff at that time, because the estate was on the Red Army’s direct route to Königsberg. Yet even in December 1944, he evacuated the second priority paintings from Königsberg Castle there as well, personally accompanying the delivery. An evacuation list found in the Stasi Archive notes 21

Fig. 11: The baroque palace on the von Schwerin estate of Wildenhoff (now Polish Dzikowo Ilaweckie), 60 km. south of Königsberg, destroyed in February 1945. From an 18th century engraving from the Duncker Collection.

75 Kul’zhenko recounted her move to Wildenhoff in “Spomyn,” later reaffirmed in an interview preserved in GA RF, f. A-659/2/44, fols. 194–195, where she explained her trip to Königsberg for an appeal to Rohde. Rohde specifically noted 78 crates in his surviving correspondence from that month.
77 See Countess von Schwerin’s published memoirs: SCHWERIN Kormorane, Brombeerranken, Erinnerungen an Ostpreußen.
paintings that were being sent to Wildenhoff, while others were designated for the Castle tower or one of the air-raid bunkers. Surviving documents regarding the transfers provide no specific indication that any crates from Kharkiv (they would have arrived via Rivne) had been in either Richau or Wildenhoff, yet Kharkiv is indicated in the July (and September) 1944 RMbO documents quoted above, suggesting a total of 85 (rather than only 78) crates were involved. The figure of 85 might well have included the 5 crates that came from Kyiv via Rivne. Yet Rohde in his later 1945 Soviet interrogation stated in two segments (III and IV) of his testimony about Ukrainian cultural valuables in East Prussia:

"III. Kharkiv Museums.
After the Germans left Ukraine in the summer of 1943 property of Kharkiv museums was given over to me containing:
1. Paintings by Western European artists.
2. Russian fine arts of the 19th century.
3. Several icons and church doors from Kovel.
The paintings (1 and 2) were packed in crates and sent to the Wildenhoff Castle near Tsinena (Korneva). The last time I saw those crates was December 1944. Starting in January 1945 that region was a war zone. The icons (3) were placed in the tower of the Royal Castle, where they were still retained.

IV. Kyiv Museums.
In addition to Western European paintings the 98 [sic] crates contained approximately 800 icons [sic]. That was the most significant collection of icons in the world. Besides those were many paintings and lithographs. I last saw the 98 crates and Kul'zhenko in December 1944."

Rohde does not provide figures for the Kharkiv or Kovel materials, but his notes about them are important to keep in mind, as possibly some of them may have shared the fate of the Kyiv treasures, or even have become intermixed. German seizure and shipping reports for art from the Kharkiv museum remain in the ERR records in Kyiv, including a shipping list dating from 24 September 1943, with item-level details of shipment to the Reich Commissariat in Rivne listing 96 paintings from the Ukrainian Art Division, 185 paintings of Western artists (with 37 icons intermixed), 12 engravings of German masters (4 by Dürer), and 25 tapestries. Available German documents have not been found that confirm that part or all of the Kharkiv shipment went on from Rivne to Königsberg. In fact, an alternate report by ERR leader Lomatzach a year later (Ratibor, 24 August 1944) notes that...
ERR staff person Ebeling had brought from Kharkiv to Kyiv a collection of art consisting of ca. 120 paintings (Italian, Flemish, Dutch, and French, as well as Viennese artists), ca. 80 Ukrainian modern paintings, ca. 50 icons, 12 folios of medieval original graphics (including Dürer and Lucas Cranach), 4 biblical manuscripts, and Ukrainian tapestries – but with no item-level lists; he suggests the security and subsequent shipping of that collection was not known. In the context of the report, it would appear that Kharkiv collection, together with art from elsewhere in Ukraine was intended for the ERR repositories in Bavaria (Höchstädt and Buxheim). If in fact, however, any of the Kharkiv art had reached Königsberg and was also housed in Wildenhoff at the end of 1944, it would have shared the fate of the Kyiv crates that were still in Kul’zhenko’s care at that time.

Rohde’s figure of 800 icons is still quoted widely, but that would appear to be an exaggeration. Kul’zhenko detailed only 320 icons from the Russian Museum in available inventories, although possibly in those inventories prepared before departure from Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi she had not listed all of the icons, including those transferred to the museum in early 1943. Curators in Kyiv suggest there may have been as many as 600 icons in the Russian Museum by the time of the German seizure, but Hryhorii Poliushko, Head Curator in the Lavra, prefers to quote the number of 540, as documented by German sources above. A 1990 publication by the Soviet Russian specialist Lidia Maksakova cites as many as 7,000 icons seized from the Russian Museum on the basis of Soviet documents that are currently classified, but that clearly is a gross exaggeration.

Rohde’s number of “98” crates from Kyiv also raises a question, because earlier Rohde had claimed moving only 78 crates from Kyiv to Wildenhoff, unless the five crates that had come via Rivne had already been deposited there earlier, and together with the smaller cartons of engravings might have raised the total he was counting; – or unless he was including the additional crates from the Königsberg Castle.

With the Red Army approaching in mid-January, just after her husband was killed in the fighting, Countess von Schwerin offered to take Kul’zhenko with her to her family estate in Brandenburg, when she departed on the 22nd of January 1945. Kul’zhenko refused and insisted on remaining with the plundered art. She supervised Polish prisoner-of-war laborers move all the crates to the cellar, when the Germans turned the mansion into a military hospital.

82 Lomatzach to ERR Hauptabteilung II Berlin (Ratibor, 24 Aug. 1944), BArch NS 30 (ERR)/53, fols. 36–36 v. (that file is available in the BArch on-line version of NS 30). It is not clear if reference was to the same collection specified in September and October 1943 that was reported sent by truck from Kharkiv to Rivne (note 81), although the contents appear to coincide at least roughly. Obviously further research is needed on the fate of the art seized by the ERR from Kharkiv and its shipping route.

83 As quoted above from Briusov’s compendium of Rohde’s correspondence submitted to the Committee for Cultural Affairs, GA RF, f. A-534/2/2, fol. 214v. In Document 10 v., Rohde to the Kulturamt, 27 Oct. 1944, he specifically mentions moving 78 crates with Kyiv art collections from Richau to Wildenhoff; subsequent letter fragments confirm the move on 13 Nov., fol. 215.

84 Maksakova Spasenie kul’turnykh tsennostei, p. 32. She cites documents in the Committee of Arts records in RGALI, f. 962, opis’ 6, delo 1180; that entire secret series (opis’ 6), which was open to researchers earlier in the 1990s, has now been reclassified. Russian Museum curators Pel’kina/Faktorovych Evakuatsiia i hrabunok (p. 117) suggested that figure impossible.
The Red Army bombardment started on the 17th of February. The fateful night of 17–18 February, when Soviet soldiers arrived, the Germans fled Wildenhoff – but not without a special SS squad setting the mansion ablaze, reportedly remarking they couldn’t “leave all this for Ivan.” Kul’zhenko could get no help to move the art before flames engulfed the three-story mansion. She was arrested by Soviet SMERSH/NKVD officers and taken away to the neighboring village of Landsberg (now Polish Górowo Iławeckie). Under NKVD interrogation (Fig. 12) in Kyiv later in 1946, she recounted, “On the 17th of February, … the German military ignited the mansion, and the priceless exhibits brought there from Kyiv were burned. … When I arrived in Landsberg (7 km from Wildenhoff), the commandant of the village informed me that the castle had burned down.” In reply to questions from the prosecutor, she admitted that she had “gone to Germany willingly […] First to Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi, and then to Königsberg on the basis of orders from Reich Commissar of Ukraine Koch.” She then explained “On the 18th of February, together with a colonel and major of the Red Army, we returned to Wildenhoff, but it was impossible to save the museum exhibits. […] On the 19th I was taken to Bartenstein (now Polish Bartoszyce) to a filtration-repatriation center and there was interrogated extensively.”

When Kul’zhenko returned to Kyiv, she was ostracized to a village in Kyiv Oblast to work in a sugar refinery, while awaiting trial. Sentenced to ten years in prison as a collaborator, she served nine and was subsequently exiled to Kostroma, where she died in 1983.

In the memoir Kul’zhenko wrote while awaiting trial in Kyiv Oblast in 1946 about her experience in East Prussia (published in Ukrainian translation in 1998), she tells approximately the same story. She kept to the same story in later interviews: given the complete destruction of the palace, it was impossible to imagine than any of the art and icons that meant so much to her had survived in the cellar amidst the rubble of the three-story mansion. She never mentioned the possibility of any removals, although she had tried to find help on the estate.

The paintings and icons from Kyiv museums that perished in Wildenhoff were among the most substantial Ukrainian cultural loss in the Second World War, but details about the destruction of Wildenhoff were never published before Ukrainian independence, and Kul’zhenko’s rehabilitation. Many important icons perished with the art. While the destruction of the Assumption Cathedral in the Lavra is perhaps the most important monument lost in Kyiv, icons from that cathedral were among the most significant ones destroyed in Wildenhoff. The oldest and most revered icon from the Lavra destroyed in Wildenhoff, the Igor (Ihorivs’ka) icon of the Mother of God, is the subject of a recent account by Hryhorii

---

85 Kul’zhenko interrogation of 11 Nov. 1946, HDA SBU, f. 6/74305 fp, vol. 1, fol. 59. Kul’zhenko’s files from Red Army filtration camps in Landsberg or Bartenstein have not been located.
Poliushko. Its gilded icon cover (Fig. 13) was found after the war in the ruins of the cathedral, but a more elaborate jeweled cover had been removed and sold in the 1920s, when the icon itself was significantly restored. An additional article on the icon by the German specialist Ivan Bentchev includes images of other icons and excerpts from Kul’zhenko’s account of the destruction of Wildenhoff.

The Postwar Search for Traces of Amber and Icons

Since the end of the war, an endless series of Soviet and foreign expeditions have combed the long-closed Kaliningrad region (oblast’) first and foremost to search for the Amber Chamber, brought to Königsberg under Koch’s orders and under the scrutiny of the amber specialist Alfred Rohde, along with other treasures from the former Russian imperial palaces in suburban Leningrad. Kaliningrad regional studies specialist Avenir Petrovich Ovsianov has assiduously followed and assisted with many of the postwar investigations, as revealed in his two published semi-popular books (1997 and 2000) devoted to the subject. His accounts describe the extent to which the Germans engaged in similar ‘scorched earth’ destruction on retreat throughout Königsberg and East Prussia, including Koch’s own estates, bunkers, and the estate Göring had taken over as his East Prussian ‘dacha’ (Koch was one of Göring’s favorites among Nazi elite)! That would have followed Himmler’s famous destruction order and paralleled Hitler’s order to destroy the most important Nazi repository for looted art from Western Europe in the salt mines above Altaussee. Fortunately the
intended Altaussee tragedy was averted by sabotage, but the tragic destruction of the Ukrainian art treasures in Wildenhoff was apparently the German revenge for their defeat in Stalingrad and the capture of East Prussia by the Red Army and expected Soviet annexation.

One of the earliest expeditions led by Professor D.D. Ivanenko from Moscow State University inspected the ruins of the Königsberg Castle at the end of April 1945. On the 25th of April they reported inspecting a room on the second floor of the southwest tower where the Castle-Museum had been, and found twenty arm chairs with labels of Tsarskoe Selo. In the same room from Ukraine Ivanenko noted, “[…] found twelve frames from the Picture Gallery of Kyiv Museum. Canvases missing. One frame belonged to a canvas by Aivazovskii, ‘U Konstantinopolie’.89 One of three Aivazovskii paintings on the German inventories from the Kyiv Russian Museum, was entitled “Moonlight on the Sea on the Shore of an Eastern City (Constantinople),” corresponding to one of the fifteen lost Aivazovskii paintings listed in the 1994 catalogue (although the Kyiv catalogue listing is “View of Cairo on a Moonlight Night”). That painting might well coincide with the empty frame in Königsberg Castle, confirming that the Germans were often sending the frames separately, and in this case, the frames were left in the Königsberg museum rather than proceeding to Richau and Wildenhoff.

An early Soviet expedition to Königsberg in June–July 1945 led by Aleksandr Jakovlevich Briusov, a prominent Soviet archeologist from the State Historical Museum (GIM) in Moscow, found what they determined were some burned out traces of the Amber Chamber in the ruins of the Königsberg Castle.90 Briusov and his colleagues briefly visited the ruins of the mansion on the former von Schwerin estate of Wildenhoff, accompanied by Rohde. In his diary Briusov reported only fragmentary walls remaining. In one of the inner basement rooms he found fragments of the von Schwerin family archive, but had no time to prepare the papers for transport.91 He speculated about the possibility that some of the crates of Ukrainian art had been removed from the Wildenhoff cellar, because he found

89 D.D. Ivanenko, “Akt,” 25 April 1945, GA RF, f. A-659/2/46, fols. 119–120. A quote from that report is included by Ovsianov, U nikh est’ rodina, p. 50. In the German crate inventories from the Kyiv Provincial Museum (East European Division), sent in January 1944, section IIC, Item no. 10 in crate O 7 (registration no. 507) was a painting by Ivan Aivazovskii, “Lunnaia noch’ nad morem na beregu vostochnogo goroda (Konstantinopol’),” 71 x 88.5, GA RF, f. A-659/2/48, fols. 97–98 (Russian translation). That registration no. 507 is listed in Ladyzheiskaja Katolog proizvedenii Kievskogo muzeia, p. 20, for an Aivazovskii painting “Vid Kaira v lunnuiu noch’” with exactly the same dimensions.

90 A typed copy of A.Ia. Briusov’s diary (received from GBL), GA RF, f. A-659/1/2. Additional manuscript documentation with a report of Briusov and T.A. Beliaeva (GBL) to the Committee for Cultural Affairs about his 1945 expedition, together with fragments of correspondence of Rohde are found in GA RF, f. A-534/2/2; that fond contains postwar records of the Committee for Cultural-Enlightenment Institutions under the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

91 Briusov, diary entries for 12 June 1945, GA RF, f. A-659/1/2, fol. 118 and fol. 120; also quoted by Ovsianov U nikh est’ rodina, pp. 123–124, and Ovsianov V ruinakh starogo zamka, pp. 264–265. Ovsianov quotes documents in the Kaliningrad archive, but they are now held in GA RF, f. A-659. Additional manuscript documentation with the full report of Briusov to the Committee for Cultural Affairs about his 1945 expedition, together with fragments of correspondence of Rohde are found in GA RF, f. A-534/2/2, fols. 213–220.
“no traces whatsoever” of the art. Despite Alfred Rohde’s denial, Briusov remained suspicious, but had no more time to investigate the surrounding area. One later Stasi report also noted rumors of crates removed before the fire.

No subsequent Soviet investigators appear to have searched further in the area around Wildenhoff. Since August 1945 Wildenhoff ended up on the Polish side of the Soviet frontier of Kaliningrad Oblast, which made access more difficult from the USSR. A Polish investigation of the Wildenhoff ruins in August 1960 found “a folder of charred drawings and etchings, some Chinese porcelain fragments, and remnants of seven other badly destroyed sculptures … and metal pieces used in icon frames. But no sign of the Amber Room.”92 Another Polish expedition in 1979 also found some fragments in Wildenhoff, as Ovsianov relates.93

Fig. 14: One of the fifteen paintings by Ivan Aivazovskii lost during the Second World War: “Summer Evening in Ukraine,” 1872, inventory nos. 166, 3209, N-8. © Image courtesy of the National Museum of Russian Art, Kyiv.

93 OVSIA NOVУих est’ rodina, pp. 119–120.
Many records of Soviet investigations are preserved in archives in Moscow and Kaliningrad. Most extensive are the impressive voluminous materials from the top-secret Soviet Commission directed from Moscow (1967–1983), with a working group under the Kaliningrad Geological-Archeological Expedition. The Commission brought together copies of documents from earlier investigations, and from various archives in the Soviet Union and Germany, as well as their own extensive reports of geological and archeological excavations and other analyzes, to say nothing of endless testimony of wartime witnesses and workers in the area. Of special note here, however, they did not uncover the LV ABM records in Kyiv, nor the largest extant ERR files held in the same Ukrainian state archive (TsDAVO). Hence they had not seen Winter’s shipping papers and Kul’zhenko’s correspondence noted above that were stashed away in those Kyiv files. As far as is known, no specialists from Ukraine were involved in the Commission and its search for lost art.

Earlier, the head of the Kaliningrad team, M.I. Popova, in April 1972 interviewed Kul’zhenko in Kostroma, mainly hoping to find more about the Amber Chamber, but Kul’zhenko stuck to her earlier story and denied the possibility of Koch’s having placed any part of the Amber Chamber in Wildenhoff. The crates Rohde had deposited on the second floor were “of secondary importance.” That those crates contained paintings from the Königsberg Castle has been confirmed by a surviving typewritten list now in the Stasi Archive in Berlin.

In the early 1980s, in cooperation with the Stasi, the Soviet Commission requisitioned copies of relevant documents in the GDR Central State Archive in Potsdam, including printouts from US microfilms of Nuremberg documents with the crate-list inventories of art.

94 GA RF, f. A-659: “Kolleksiia dokumentov po rozysku na territorii Kaliningradskoi oblasti lantarnoi komnaty i drugikh museinykh tsennostei, pokhishchennykh v gody Velikoi Otechestven­noi voiny [Collection of documents on the search in the territory of Kaliningrad Oblast for the Amber Chamber and other museum valuables lost in the years of the Great Patriotic War].” According to Ovsianov, the collection was earlier held in Kaliningrad. This fond was only recently declassified, and is still available only by special permission; I am grateful to GA RF director Sergei Mironenko for arranging my access. Hryhorii Poliushko, the only Ukrainian to have consulted the fond, kindly advised me about the inventories that he had been able to consult only briefly, but he had not realized they were from US Nuremberg documents.

95 M.I. Popova’s report on her trip to Kostroma and meetings with Kul’zhenko, together with a fragment of Kul’zhenko’s April 1946 Memoir remain in GA RF, f. A-659/2/44, esp. fols. 192–196. See also OVSIANOV U nikh est’ rodina, p. 109.
the Germans had removed from Kyiv to Königsberg. So far none of Kul’zhenko’s own papers from East Prussia have surfaced. Ovsianov was ill-informed when he wrote that some of her papers were found in Potsdam. The quotations that he incorrectly attributes to her papers in Potsdam coincide precisely with those from the 1944 German inventories, copies of which from the US microfilms in Potsdam are among the Moscow Commission records.\textsuperscript{98}

Ovsianov interviewed Kul’zhenko in Kostroma in 1979 (Fig. 15) and recounts that as he and his wife were departing, Kul’zhenko was on the verge of revealing “something important,” but then changed her mind. Ovsianov concluded. “We will never ever know the secret of Polina Arkadiïvna, but a secret there was.”\textsuperscript{99}

\textbf{Suspicious Survivors from Kyiv}

The most significant suspicions about surviving art from Wildenhoff come from reports of two paintings from the Kyiv Museum of Western and Oriental Art that surfaced in Perm in the 1970s. Ovsianov and others have mistakenly assumed that they were ‘saved’ from Wildenhoff.\textsuperscript{100} It turns out, however, that the two seventeenth-century works in question, both of which have been returned to Kyiv, had been ‘borrowed’ on behalf of the Kyiv General Commissar and were never returned before the Germans retreated from Kyiv. Hence they were probably taken to Königsberg with the retreating German RKU command from Ukraine.

A painting by the Flemish artist Jan Miel (1599–1653), “Lazzaroni” (Scene from the Life of Tramps), was gifted to the Perm Art Gallery in 1966 by an army wife, having been purchased by her husband from a German in Königsberg in 1946. A second painting, by the Dutch artist Cornelis Beelt (d. c. 1702), “On The Beach in Scheveningen” (Fig. 16) had been likewise found in Königsberg in 1945 and then surfaced in the same Perm mu-

\textsuperscript{96} One of the websites featuring the Amber Chamber suggests it may have been moved to Wildenhoff: \url{http://www.amberroom.org/locations-castles-wildenhoff.htm} (15 Jan. 2013), but no evidence has been found to support that hypothesis.

\textsuperscript{97} BStU MfS, AB Neiber, 392, MfS – Sekr. Neiber 38, listing 35 numbered paintings with evacuation notes. The more valuable paintings were indicated as removed to the Castle tower (\textit{Schlossturm}), the cellar air raid shelter (\textit{Luftschutzkeller}), or the \textit{Hochbunker}. Berlin provenance researcher Nina Senger kindly assisted me in finding the documents in the former Stasi Archive. See also Rohde’s letter to Zimmermann in Berlin (n.d., 1944) about the evacuation of paintings from the Königsberg Castle quoted by Ovsianov \textit{U nikh est’ rodina}, p. 94; elsewhere in the book, passim. Ovsianov notes findings after the war from the Königsberg collections.

\textsuperscript{98} Ovsianov \textit{U nikh est’ rodina}, pp. 123–124. Ovsianov admitted to me in a telephone interview in August 2011 that he had seen only the inventories from Potsdam and had never been there himself; he had not known they were from US Nuremberg documents. He was also not aware of her memoir report “Spomyn” that Serhii Bilokin had published in Ukrainian, although some fragments of it were available to the Commission in Kaliningrad.

\textsuperscript{99} Ovsianov \textit{U nikh est’ rodina}, p. 123.

\textsuperscript{100} Ovsianov \textit{U nikh est’ rodina}, p. 120. \textit{Kot Ukrainiïns’ki kul’turni tsinnosti v Rosï}, earlier commented on these returns, but neither he nor Ovsianov were aware of the details raised in this article.
Both paintings appear on the same receipt for ‘borrowed’ art, dated 23 March 1942, and do not appear on the German lists of paintings shipped to Königsberg with Kul’zhenko that went to Wildenhoff. However, their odyssey continued to provoke suspicions and hope that more art may have been ‘saved’ from Wildenhoff. Such was also evident in a report by the Russian art journalist Evgraf Konchin, who having heard about

The painting by Cornelis Beelt with that title appears on one of the ChGK lists of museum losses, with dimensions 45 x 53.5. Khanenko Museum curator Olena Zhyvkova discovered its title should not have been “Scheveningen” (seaside suburb of The Hague), but rather “Near Edmond aan See” (in northern Holland). See Zhyvkova Uratsovane uzberezhzhia, p. 5. She documents the borrowing on the basis of a notation in the museum register. The painting there is cited with the title simply “On the Beach” (Am Strand); the Kyiv museum registration number is given as 851, corresponding to the ChGK list, but Zhyvkova gives the registration number as 332 Zhk.

I am grateful to Olena Zhyvkova of the Khanenko Museum for assistance in clarifying details about the fate of these two paintings. Both appear on the list of 41 “borrowed” from the Museum of West European Art, as per remaining receipt signed on behalf of the Kiev General Commissar – “Empfangsbescheinigung” (23 Mar. 1942), GA RF, 7021/116/250, fol. 62, and as recorded in a Khanenko Museum register.
the paintings that surfaced in Perm, also went to interview Polina Kul’zhenko in her Kostroma exile. He came away from the interview with no new information or other leads.103 Yet clearly the details of the Perm ‘survival’ cases do not suggest those two paintings had ever been in Wildenhoff.

Much more frustrating, recently a Khanenko Museum curator received a call from London about a Dutch late seventeenth-century oil painting from the Khanenko Collection that was spotted in a private collection in London, namely “The Portrait of the Family of van der Meer” (Fig. 17) by Isaack Paling (active ca. 1664–1703). The caller allegedly identified the painting thanks to a small image (no. 204) in the 1998 Kyiv catalogue of wartime losses, taken from the prerevolutionary Khanenko catalogue. According to the museum listing, van der Meer, who was identified as the Dutch ambassador to Italy, is pictured with his wife and two sons, along with ten members of the family (oil on canvas, 115 x 130 cm). Unfortunately, the informant gave no contact information, nor details about the present whereabouts of the painting, and no further communication has been received. The Paling painting does not appear on any of the available German ‘borrowed’ lists, or the German shipping lists to Königsberg from 1943–1944. We therefore cannot be sure if it was shipped to Königsberg. In any case, how the painting may have reached London remains a mystery, if in fact it is really the one from Kyiv.

Fig. 17: Painting by Isaack Paling, “Portrait of the Family van der Meer,” from the Khanenko Collection, recently allegedly surfaced in London, as pictured in the 1998 catalogue of wartime losses, image no. 204. Image from a 1912–1913 printed album of Dutch paintings in the Khanenko Collection. Reproduced with permission © The Bohdan and Varvara Khanenko National Museum of Arts, Kyiv.

103 KONCHEN Kartiny, opalennye voini, pp. 245–246.
Yet about the same time another painting from the Khanenko Collection surfaced in a private collection in Western Europe, corresponding to a small image in the 1998 catalogue of wartime losses. That painting does appear on the German receipt left in Kyiv and is also found on the German shipping list from Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi to Königsberg. Presumably it was removed from one of the priority crates there, rather than being sent with Kul’zhenko and the 78 crates to Richau and then to Wildenhoff. Since restitution negotiations are still pending, further details are not mentioned here. But now that its Kyiv provenance has been authenticated, it is the first painting from the museum that has turned up in Western Europe among the many cultural trophies of the Second World War. The painting does not correspond to any possible paintings on the list from the Koch Collection that was deposited in Weimar in February 1945. Further investigation is needed to determine its possible migration route and fill in the long gap in its postwar provenance.

Just as this article was going to press, yet a third painting from the Khanenko Museum surfaced on auction in the West. In this case it was advertised to go to the block in New York on the 29th of January 2013. The early eighteenth-century French painting was identified as of probable Kyiv provenance, thanks to the Magdeburg Lostart.de database. Fortunately the New York auction house involved withheld the lot from sale, following a report from the Art Loss Register in London, identifying it as corresponding to an image in the Kyiv 1998 catalogue of paintings lost in the Second World War. According to provenance indications, it first surfaced after the war in a private collection in London in 1953. From information supplied by the Khanenko Museum, this painting was acquired by the predecessor Art Museum of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in 1925 with other pieces from the Shchavinskii Collection from Petrograd. Currently the painting is being held in New York, pending negotiations for its return to Kyiv. Its wartime migration has yet to be determined, as it does not appear either on any of the German ‘borrowed’ lists or on the packing lists or inventories of the paintings from that museum removed under Koch’s orders in 1943 for shipment to Königsberg.

These cases nonetheless demonstrate the importance of full disclosure and wide circulation of details about wartime losses. Simultaneously they demonstrate the lingering hope, intermingled with frustrating problems, that can arise for state museums in the former Soviet Union, such as Ukraine, that would still like to recover their wartime lost treasures. In the pending west European restitution case, the documented Khanenko provenance and the preserved German shipping lists should help establish a legal basis for claim by the Kyiv museum, but laws in many European countries favor “good faith” purchasers over post-Soviet museums, and the appropriate mechanism for such a claim still remains uncertain, even as the gap in provenance remains. One can only hope that a “just and fair solution” can be found, as suggested by the “Washington Principles for Nazi-Confiscated Art,” signed by representatives of the Countries participating in the Washington Conference on Holocaust Era Assets, 3 December 1998. Those
principles, reaffirmed in several subsequent international resolutions, were again most recently the subject of international concern in the 27 November 2012 Symposium in The Hague.104

It is nonetheless important to recognize that such cases of lost art from Ukraine clearly do not fall under the category of private Jewish Holocaust-related losses, similar to most of those considered in restitution cases in Western Europe and the United States. It should also be remembered that the German shipping lists identified recently cover only 112 paintings out of a total of 484 paintings reported lost in the 1998 Khanenko Museum catalogue; inventories have not been located for additional thirteen crates (W 1-13) shipped from Kamianets'-Podil’s’kyi to Königsberg. Fortunately a pre-1941 museum register and many pre-1917 images remain for paintings in the Khanenko Collection, and since the collapse of the Soviet Union, curators are able to establish more normal contacts with their Western counterparts and specialists abroad who have been dealing with wartime losses and restitution issues.

**Documenting Ukrainian Art Losses in East Prussia**

Erich Koch was one of the major Nazi war criminals not brought to trial in Nuremberg. The British found him with the assumed name of Rolf Berger disguised as an agricultural worker in a village near Hamburg only in 1949. Despite the Soviet demand for extradition, the British turned him over to the Poles for trial; his death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. He died at the age of ninety in 1986 in a Polish prison in Barszewo (earlier German Wartenburg), not far from Wildenhoff. He never admitted any more details about the Amber Chamber, let alone the fate of the art from Ukraine, including the destruction of most of those art treasures in Wildenhoff, or the possible survival of items seized for his personal collection.

Alfred Rosenberg, by contrast, was one of the major Nazi war criminals tried and put to death at the International Military Tribunal (IMT) in Nuremberg. Although there may be no end to the war crimes, including cultural atrocities, for which he was responsible, the art massacre in Wildenhoff was not one of them. However, when Alfred Rosenberg was tried in a session of 21 February 1946, the Soviet prosecutor ironically read excerpts from an RMbO report to Rosenberg in Berlin dated 14 September 1944 about the art looted from Ukrainian museums that Koch had brought to East Prussia:

> “The Reich Commissioner for Ukraine has stored the paintings and art objects that were brought back from Kiew and Charkow [sic. Kharkiv] in East Prussia in the following safe places:
> 1. The estate of Richau near Wehlau,
> 2. Wildenhoff Manor (Owner Count Schwerin).
> Exact list of the contents 65 wooden crates is attached. As to the other twenty crates, fifty-seven portfolios and one roll of engravings, their inventory has not been taken to date. Among

the paintings there are a great number of very early icons, works by famous masters of Ger­
man, Italian and Dutch schools of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as well
as works of the best Russian masters of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. [They com­
prise] the most valuable works of the known Ukrainian art possession, […] the only collec­
tions of this sort with international repute now within German territory.”

The Soviet prosecutor submitted the document with the inventories as an exhibit to the
court (USSR-372/055-PS), having received it from the US-prepared Nuremberg PS (Paris­
Storey) series. 105 Rosenberg authenticated the document when it was shown him before his
trial, although he claimed – undoubtedly correctly – never to have seen it. 106

Curiously, however, the Soviet prosecutor did not mention the destruction of the art in
Wildenhoff, nor did he blame Rosenberg for that, if indeed the Soviets preparing for the
trial had known about the disaster. Perhaps they did not want to admit German anger over
their imperious annexation of East Prussia that had never previously been part of the Rus­
sian Empire or the Soviet Union. Kul’zhenko at that point was ostracized and awaiting her
own trial as an already designated “collaborator,” and hence could not have been believed,
quoted, or brought to court as a witness in Nuremberg. There is no indication that the So­
viet representatives there knew her story of the destroyed art in Wildenhoff, as an example
of the German scorched earth policy in East Prussia. Or perhaps there was a deliberate So­
viet attempt to suppress that part of the story, not wanting to emphasize the bloody annex­
atation of East Prussia, let alone admitting Ukrainian “collaborators” to the world audience
at Nuremberg.

The text of the German memorandum itself read before the court (exhibit USSR-372; 055-PS) was published as part of the IMT proceedings in Russian, English, French, and German, including a Soviet popularized mass publication. However, the full text of the covering report (originally dated July 1944) was not included in any of the published ver­sions, nor were any of the appended “list[s] of contents … attached.” Nor were those lists
ever made available to Ukrainian authorities before their discovery and identification in
Moscow in a long-restricted collection in the summer of 2011. Even more curious, the in­
ventories that were in fact attached to the original Soviet Nuremberg Exhibit 372 (055-PS)
lacked the initial three pages covering the seizures from the Western Division of the Kyiv

---

105 As presented by Lt. Gen. M.Iu. Raginsky (State Counselor of Justice Second Class, Assistant
Prosecutor for the USSR), Sixty-Fourth Day, Thursday 21 Feb. 1946, in: Niurnbergski pro­
tsess, vol. 4, p. 414. The quotation is from the official English translation as published in: The
Trial of German Major War Criminals, vol. 8, pp. 61–62. French and German versions were
also published. Raginsky stated that the quoted text was from Document Book 6, p. 21.

The document quoted is published in English (but without the appended inventories) in: Nazi
Göpel to Chief of the Political Directorate Staff [SS-Ogruf Gottlieb Berger], RMBO (Berlin,
12 Sep. 1944); with a repeated copy of the same text addressed to the Reich Minister (14 Sep.
1944) [signed by von der Milwe-Schroeden], Subject: Works of art shipped back from Ukraine
[Secret]; with a further request that a copy be transferred to the Führer. A printed edition of
the complete document USSR-372/055-PS has not been located. See note 108 below regarding
archival copies and note 109 regarding the copy in the US microfilm publication.

106 An attestation that Rosenberg was shown the document and asserted its authenticity is found
with the US file for IMT document 055-PS (USSR-372), NACP, RG 238.
Accordingly, it is little wonder that curators in the Kyiv museums, while they were aware of the Nuremberg citation about art from Ukraine in East Prussia, even with the errors and questionable figures it contained, were not aware of the existence of the inventories, with lists of many of their paintings destroyed in Wildenhoff.108

The earlier July 1944 full variant of the same memorandum (with reference to Kul’zenko and recommendation for evacuation of the art to central or southern Germany, with more thorough inventorization and photographs) was prepared later for the subsequent US war crimes trials in Nuremberg (document NG-4353). Apparently it was not used in court. As noted earlier, the copy in the US National Archives in College Park, MD (NACP) appears to be an original German carbon copy, with all 47 of the earlier January 1944 crate inventories intact.109

The immediate postwar ChGK reports never mentioned the transport to East Prussia and the destruction there. They never mentioned the German shipping documents already in Kyiv with the LV ABM records, nor did they report Kul’zenko’s testimony of the destruction of the art and icons in the mansion of Wildenhoff. For the Kyiv Museum of Russian Art the ChGK had attested to a total of 4,629 items taken away (vyvezeno) and 357

107 Prestupnye tseli, p. 291. The 1963 edition includes a facsimile of the 14 Sep. 1944 version of the memorandum on a facing page [p. 290]; later editions (2nd edn, 1968 and 3rd edn, 1985) include a few more documents, but omit the facsimile. A footnote on page 291 refers to the inventories describing the looted art in the IMT records in GA RF (then TsGAOR SSSR), f. 7445/2/125, fols. 177–214 (but that Soviet archival copy lacks the first three pages – see note 108).

108 See ROSLAVEVS’ KYIV’S KYI MUZEI ZAKHIDNOHO I SKHIDNOHO MYSTETSTVA, pp. 86 and 90. Even had they found the GA RF inventories, the first three pages covering 11 crates from the Western European Division (i.e. their museum) are missing in all three GA RF copies. Curators in that museum were quite surprised when I showed them copies of the inventories I had found in Moscow in August 2011.

Three archival copies of document USSR-372/055-PS are among the official Soviet IMT records in GA RF, f. 7445/2/125, fols. 176–214; 7445/2/127, fols. 164–204; and 7445/2/138, fols. 311–348. The negative photostats from the German originals are now badly faded and some pages are out of order. They have inventories for only the 36 crates from the East European Division, but lack the title and first three pages covering 11 crates (MW 1–11) from the Western Division. No copies survive in the French records in the Archives nationales. A copy of the Soviet Exhibit USSR-372 from the British records is included in the US Microfilm Publication T988: Prosecution Exhibits, roll 5 – USSR.

The remainder of the inventories are exactly the same in format and content as those presented in NG-4353, but they were not copied from the same original. At least one copy of the 14 Sep. 1944 memorandum is signed and appears to be the same as the copy presented in NG-4353, but the June 1944 memorandum in NG-4353 is not repeated in 055-PS.

109 I am grateful to Stephen Wiles at the Harvard Law School Library, Avram Brown, and the Inter-Library Loan Office at Harvard for tracking down a copy of NARA Microfilm Publication T1139; both the original German text and a certified English translation are included on the microfilm. The Staff Evidence Analysis form (SEA) at the start of the microfilmed version indicates the source of the original as RMbO Rosenberg files. I am grateful to Greg Bradsher of the US National Archives for helping me track down the various extant copies of the Nuremberg documents.
destroyed (*unichtozheno*); the number for paintings, icons, and drawings (listed together) came to a total of 1,885, while a separate tally covered 2,744 items of decorative arts (listings nos. 1–448). In the immediate postwar years, the composite Moscow ChGK figure gave a total of 25,390 exhibits removed from the Museum of Western and Oriental Art (with the larger number mostly decorative arts), with a breakdown of 390 exhibits (paintings and sculpture) and an additional 25,000 engravings. With further investigation in postwar decades, the figure for paintings lost during the war rose to 474 and the figure for engravings was reduced to 20,695.

Most Kyiv museum specialists still believe today that most of the Ukrainian collections were lost or destroyed in the Königsberg area, as evidenced in the two catalogues of war losses published in 1994 and 1998 following Ukrainian independence. The 1994 catalogue for losses of the Kyiv Museum of Russian Art – issued in a less-than quality rotaprint Russian edition – was a simple unnumbered list of over 800 paintings and ca. 350 icons – including those in a separate section at the end covering the icons transferred from the Lavra during the war. No illustrations or provenance indications were available for any of the lost art, which also included watercolors, miniatures, and graphic works. The 1998 English-language catalogue of 474 lost paintings from the Khanenko Museum (Fig. 18; then the Museum of Western and Oriental Art), sponsored by the National Commission for the Restitution of Cultural Treasures to Ukraine, presented a much nicer printed edition with scattered small black

110 The ChGK composite report (Moscow, 1946) is found in GA RF, f. 7021 (ChGK)/116/298, fol. 6. The original official ChGK-signed and certified detailed inventory for Russian Museum losses is in 7021/116/270, with registration numbers and ruble values attributed to each; a second copy is in file 269, which also includes a selective inventory of the most important losses; those are also repeated in 7021/116/298, fols. 84–96.

111 The ChGK composite figure is found in GA RF, f. 7021/116/250, fols. 2–28 (signed copy), while the breakdown cited appears at the top of the item-level list of most important losses: GA RF, f. 7021/116/298, fol. 97; the list follows fols. 98–102 (68 paintings and 10 other objects).

112 *Roslavets*’ Kyivs’kyi muzei zakhidnoho i skhidnoho mystetstva, pp. 92–93.

113 Pet’kina [et al.] Katalog proizvedenii Kievskogo muzeia russkogo iskusstva. The Introduction cites one of the Soviet-published German documents about the Ukrainian art in East Prussia that had been an official Soviet IMT exhibit, p. 9 (note 4), but does not identify it as IMT exhibit USSR-372 (055-PS) – see below. See also Pet’kina/Faktorovych Evakuatsiia i hrabunok.
and white illustrations of many of the lost paintings. Although again, no provenance indications or German documentation were provided.\textsuperscript{114}

Efforts are now underway in both museums for new, more professional catalogues with more images and precise references to the German shipping documents and other remaining sources. It will be important to distinguish carefully and document separately those paintings and other museum exhibits removed in 1941 and 1942 in the German so-called “borrowing” operation during occupation, and not returned, because those are the ones that could most probably still remain at large. We now know that some of those “borrowed” objects did come back to the museums in 1942, at least for the Russian Museum, and then joined those sent to East Prussia.

When the Khanenko catalogue appeared in 1998, the Commission suggested a more sophisticated database -- or “information bank” as there explained in English, and indeed such an effort would mesh with other international efforts. Over ten years later, the head of the State Control Service for Displaced Cultural Valuables, Yurii Savchuk, at a press conference in Kyiv in February 2010, again called for an electronic database.\textsuperscript{115} However, the Ukrainian Commission was abolished in September 2011 and Savchuk was dismissed as its director. Many question now if there can be any hope that successors in the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture could provide the leadership and support continued efforts.

Possibilities and suspicions about surviving art from Kyiv remain, but thus far no confirmation of survivors from Wildenhoff has been found. But now that question arises again with three paintings from Kyiv surfacing in the West. Especially now that more German lists and shipping inventories have been found, further analysis of museum losses for paintings shipped to Königsberg becomes important. In Western Europe, German wartime documentation often provided the most crucial keys to identification and restitution of wartime losses. Soviet perspectives and the systematic suppression of surviving German and “collaborator” documents prevented adequate analysis of wartime losses and displacements. Today new incentives to search for accurate data about cultural losses and migration become vital for Eastern Europe. Now that we have also found more lists and inventories for the “borrowed art”, these need to be distinguished from the icons and paintings the Germans seized from the Kyiv museums on retreat in September and October of 1943. All such German data will require careful correlation with existing annotations during occupation in surviving museum registers and other reports. Indeed the recent examples of paintings from Ukraine that have surfaced raise the imperative for a more complete online database for wartime cultural losses with more international cooperation on the part of Ukrainian curators with Western provenance researchers, as well as art-loss analyzes and auction circles.

\textsuperscript{114} ROLSLAVETS’ Catalogue of Works of Western European Painters. See also ROLSLAVETS’ Kiyiv’s’kyi muzei zakhidnoho i shidnoho mystetstva. Most of the images were reproduced from an unfinished prewar WWI printed catalogue segment.

\textsuperscript{115} Yurii Savchuk as quoted on the Ukrainian Portal, 5 Feb. 2010 at: http://www.ukrainian.org/political-news/more-than-500-thousand-of-artickles-of-cultural-property-have-been-returned-to-ukraine-since-its-independence (15 Jan. 2013). I am grateful to Yurii Savchuk, who was behind these efforts and had been encouraging my research.
Meanwhile, investigation continues about the content and provenance of Erich Koch’s personal art collection, because little has been previously known about its formation and fate. We already know that in sharp contrast to the treasures from Kyiv museums that were intentionally destroyed by the Germans in Wildenhoff, in the same month of February 1945, Koch succeeded in evacuating a significant part of his own art collection from his Königsberg estate to Weimar (East Germany). We do not know what portion of his collection was deposited in Weimar, but we know half of the collection that arrived there was hijacked further West in April 1945, and has virtually disappeared. Three and a half years later, in Autumn 1948, that part of Koch’s collection remaining in Weimar was seized from a bank vault by art specialists from the Soviet Military Administration in Germany (SVAG/SMAD) and shipped to the USSR. That seizure was first reported by the same popular Russian art journalist mentioned above, Evgraf Konchin.\textsuperscript{116} Currently, more details based on newly discovered Soviet and German archival documents are now under investigation, but regrettably some of the Moscow files needed have recently been reclassified.\textsuperscript{117}

There were rumors – and enough for the East German Stasi to start serious investigation – that the Amber Chamber was evacuated from East Prussia to Thuringia in February 1945 together with the Koch Collection. Neither the Stasi nor all of the treasure hunters who have tried so far have recovered more traces of the Amber Chamber. Rohde never revealed more substantial information before his death in December 1945. Erich Koch was unable to save the Amber Chamber, brought to Königsberg under his orders, although Ovsianov found some evidence that Koch had hoped the Amber Chamber would have been evacuated. On the other hand, once the Red Army arrived, neither Koch nor Rohde appear to have had any intention of saving the remaining art from Kyiv museums that reached Königsberg. Apparently however, Koch had removed some choice paintings from the Western Division crates shipped via Rivne, presumably when they first arrived in Königsberg. Four German ones coincide with listings in his own collection evacuated to Weimar. We now also know that at least one for sure shipped from Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi to Königsberg disappeared before the fire in Wildenhoff. Koch may well have removed others, as we now suspect, but no surviving documents have been found to reveal such details. The rest of the treasures from Kyiv that came to Königsberg with the shipment via Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyi in Kul’zhenko’s care were destroyed the same month of February 1945 that he succeeded in sending his personal collection to Weimar and part of it further West.

\textsuperscript{116} Evgraf Vasil’evich Konchin, as quoted by OVSIAKOV U nikh est’ rodina, p. 73 (cited as “Rossiiskaia gazeta,” 30 June 1994, but the article could not be found there). Konchin has repeated the same story in several successive publications, including: Plennye sokrovishcha, Voin Rossii, Dec. 1999, no. 12, p. 90; KONCHIN Kartiny, opalennye voinoi, pp. 308–309; and most recently, KONCHIN Vozvrashchenie utrachennogo, pp. 288–289.

\textsuperscript{117} These include some of the SVAG cultural restitution files that I was able to identify several years ago among Soviet Foreign Trade records in RGAE (f. 413, opis’ 16), as will be explained in more detail elsewhere.
While the Stasi did not find the Amber Chamber, or even specific fresh data about its fate, they amassed an extensive group of documents in the course of their search, now held by the Stasi Archive in Berlin. Their collection stands as an impressive counterpart to the collection brought together by the Soviet Moscow-Kaliningrad Commission mentioned above that was likewise searching for the Amber Chamber and other art treasures in Kaliningrad Oblast. The Stasi did find more information about the contents of the Koch Collection that was evacuated to Weimar and about the fate of the man to whom Koch had entrusted its fate. As a result of those documents and related sources elsewhere, a few specific paintings in Koch’s personal collection can now be identified as undoubtedly of provenance in the Khanenko Museum, as long suspected. None of those paintings that were transported further West have been returned to Kyiv. Neither have any paintings from the Koch Collection that SVAG transported to the USSR.118

Simultaneously, thanks to Stasi documentation and other Western sources, we find that a few of the paintings Koch sent to Weimar came from German seizures from Holocaust victims in Western Europe. The provenance and fate of Erich Koch’s personal collection thus raises the intriguing interplay of European-wide migration routes for works of art that intersected during the war in East Prussia and returned to the West thereafter. The destruction of art from the Kyiv museums, identification of possible survivors, and the multinational provenance of the Koch Collection underscore a major contrast in Nazi art looting in Eastern and Western Europe. In the West, Nazi art looters seized mainly private Jewish collections belonging to Holocaust victims. By contrast in the East, and especially in occupied Soviet territories including eastern Ukraine, major state collections were the victims of Nazi art-looting. Almost all of the art objects lost or destroyed came from Soviet state museums, although many of them were originally from private and religious collections nationalized under Soviet rule.

That public-versus-private contrast is also apparent within the personal collection of Commissar of Ukraine and Gauleiter of East Prussia Erich Koch, as will be seen in a study to follow. While Koch succeeded in saving at least part of his own private collection though evacuation first to Eastern Germany and then to the West, the remaining state collections he ordered seized from Kyiv were destroyed in East Prussia when his Nazi homeland was invaded by the Red Army. Hitler and Himmler had ordered scorched earth on retreat at the end of the war, even for their cultural trophies. Perhaps the destruction in Wildenhoff, like the destruction of Koch’s own estates, was Erich Koch’s personal revenge for the Soviet conquest and annexation of East Prussia where under Nazi auspices he had made his fortune and forged his homeland.

After capture by the Red Army, Wildenhoff ended up in Poland rather than in the Soviet-annexed Kaliningrad Oblast. Although the Soviets had requested Koch’s extradition, the British turned him over to the Poles, and indeed many hundreds of thousands of Polish citizens had been the victims of his brutal rule. Ironically after his death sentence in Poland was commuted to life imprisonment, Koch lived to the age of 90 and died in a prison not far from Wildenhoff, even closer to the city where Polina Kul’zhenko had been held in a “filtration center” and undergone repatriation before her return to Kyiv for trial and exile to Kostroma. Meanwhile, to add another level of irony, many of the early ar-

118 Available details about the Koch Collection will be covered in the sequel in preparation.
chives from Kyiv that Winter had also evacuated to Kam”ianets’-Podil’s’kyi together with the art, went on to Troppau and then to western Bohemia, where they were found by the US Army and were safely returned to Kyiv in October 1945. Many of the archives Winter left in Kyiv were destroyed in the course of recapture of Kyiv by the Red Army. Winter himself meanwhile returned safely to Western Germany and, following denazification, became the first president of the Bundesarchiv.
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Summary:

Art and Icons Lost in East Prussia:
The Fate of German Seizures from Kyiv Museums

To encourage needed study of art loss and displacements on the Eastern Front, this article, based on newly opened sources, presents a case study of German seizure of art and icons from two neighboring museums in Kyiv, both founded on rich nationalized prerevolutionary collections. What are now the Kyiv National Museum of Russian Art and the Varvara and Bohdan Khanenko National Museum of Arts were combined during German occupation as divisions of the Kiev Provincial Museum (Landesmuseum Kiew). Lists found in Moscow reveal many art objects "borrowed" from those museums to embellish German offices and lodgings (Autumn 1941–1942). During retreat from Kyiv (September–October 1943) the Germans transferred approximately 80 crates of art from those two museums (including an estimated 500 icons from the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra earlier moved to the Russian Museum) to Kam"ianets'-Podil’s’kyi, and another 5 crates to RKU headquarters in Rivne. Erich Koch, Reich Commissar of Ukraine, and Gauleiter and Oberpräsident of East Prussia, ordered all that art transferred to Königsberg by January 1944, together with Ukrainian museum curator Polina Kul’zhenko. Some paintings were removed for Koch’s personal collection, but most of the art
Art and Icons Lost in East Prussia: The Fate of German Seizures from Kyiv Museums

from Kyiv was stored first on the estate of Richau (now Rus. Tel’manovo; c.70 km east of Königsberg). In November 1944, Königsberg Museum director Alfred Rohde moved the 78 crates to Wildenhoff (70 km south of Königsberg, now in Poland). The Germans intentionally burned down the mansion when the Red Army arrived in February 1945.

Copies of German crate lists discovered in a Moscow archive detail content of a total of 16 crates (over half the 29 reported) removed from the Western Division (c. 112 paintings and 13 sculptures), and 37 crates (out of 54) removed from the East European Division (646 paintings and 320 icons) – presumably prepared by the Ukrainian curators. German 1944 reports about the seized art from Ukraine in East Prussia with crate inventories were prepared as US Nuremberg documents. One was submitted as an official Soviet IMT Exhibit, but the Soviet Prosecutor did not mention the total destruction. While that 1944 IMT report was published, the crate inventories never were (in addition to those in Moscow, copies remain with the Nuremberg records in the US National Archives).

The art destroyed in East Prussia was among the most substantial Ukrainian cultural losses in the Second World War. Speculations continue about possible survivors because one Dutch and one Flemish painting from the Khanenko Collection – both on a March 1942 ‘borrowed’ list – were gifted to a Perm museum, one in 1966 and another in 1975, having been “purchased” by Soviet officers in Königsberg in 1945; both have returned to Kyiv. In the past two years, two paintings surfaced on auction in the West, one of them listed on German shipping lists to Königsberg, the other not; restitution negotiations are pending for their return to Kyiv. A third painting (17th c. Dutch) was reportedly spotted in London. Further international disclosure in a well-documented database of losses is badly needed.